(ഖ) അതിനുശേഷം ഇപ്പോൾ അതുണ്ടായിട്ടില്ലേ;

(ന) അപ്പോൾ നിന്നും വില്ലേജിന്റെ പടിഞ്ഞാറെ അറ്റത്തേക്കു വൻ നഷ്ടം ഇല്ലേ?

മിസ്റ്റർ യു. കണ്ടർമേനോൻ.—(ക) അതെ.

(ഖ) അതെ.

(ന) ഉണ്ട്.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. എം. ഇബ്രാഹിം.—ഈ വില്ലേജാപ്പീസ് വില്ലേജിന്റെ മദ്ധ്യത്തിലാക്കുവാൻ വല്ല തടസ്ഥവുമുണ്ടോ?

മിസ്റ്റർ യു. കണ്ടർമേനോൻ.—അതിനെപ്പറ്റി എഴുത്തുകുത്തുകൾ നടത്തിവരെ ഒരു സ്ഥലം എടുക്കുവാൻ ശുപാർശ ചെയ്തിട്ടുണ്ട്. ആ സ്ഥലം ഞാൻപോയി നോക്കണമെന്നു വിചാരിച്ചിരിയ്ക്കുകയാണ്.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. എം. ഇബ്രാഹിം.—അതു കഴിയുന്നതു വേഗത്തിൽ ചെയ്യുമോ?

മിസ്റ്റർ യു. കണ്ടർമേനോൻ.—ഈ കൌൺസിൽ കഴിഞ്ഞാലുടനെ ചെയ്യാം.

Chittur Municipal Council—reduction of House-tax.

336. Mr. P. Krishna Menon.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) did the Chittur Municipal Council raise the question of the general reduction of house-tax when the budget estimates for 1109 were submitted as advised by the Government in their order D. Dis. 6233/08, dated 14th December 1932 (See Meenam Session report p. 1093);

(2) did not the Government reject the request of the Council contained in a resolution for the same purpose;

(3) what was the reason for the Government's refusal when the Council unanimously made the recommendation?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—Yes.

(2) Yes, in the first instance when the question was raised in the course of 1108; but the Council was requested to raise the question at the time of consideration of the revised estimate for 1108 and the budget estimate of 1109. The Council accordingly raised the question at the proper time, and the reduction proposed was sanctioned.

(3) It was at first thought that the financial position of the Council did not justify the reduction of the tax.

Timber sales—loss.

337. Mr. P. Krishna Menon.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(1) how many contracts were entered into by Government on the one part and the would-be purchasers on the other for the sale of timber in the years 1107 and 1108 ;

(2) how many of them failed to carry out the terms of the contract ;

(3) in how many cases had the timber contracted to be purchased to be resold by Government on account of the default of the contractors ;

(4) what was the contract price and the resale price respectively of each of the defaulted contracts ?

(5) what is the total loss incurred by Government on these ;

(6) are there not many cases amongst them from whom damages cannot be realised ;

(7) please give the names of such of the contractors who have paid the whole purchase money, though not within the stipulated time ;

(8) are Government compelling such purchasers to pay interest also on the money delayed to be paid ?

Mr. T. Narayana Menon.—(1) The system of entering into mutual contracts between the Government on the one part and the would-be purchasers on the other is not in vogue, the prevailing system being to enter into contracts by parties with the Government. There were 16 instances of the kind in 1107 and 1108.

(2) Four.

(3) One.

(4) Rs. 12—8—0 a candy.
Rs. 6—0—0 a candy.

(5) Rs. 7,680.

(6) No. only one.

(7) 1. Mr. K. Kuttan Nayar.
2 ,, A. P. Varunny.
3 ,, Muhammadkutti Rowther
4 ,, C. V. Venkitasami Chetty.
5 ,, M. V. Thomas.
6 ,, T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar
7 Messrs. Tata Oil Mills, Ltd., Ernakulam.
8 Mr. B. S. Thripuranthaka Mudaliar.
9 Dr. J. V. Kamath.
10. Mr. T. V. Kochu Devassi.

(8) Yes, if the agreement provides for it.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Is this amount of Rs. 7,680 due from one person?

Mr. T. Narayana Menon.—Yes.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Is he a Cochinite or an outsider?

Mr. T. Narayana Menon.—He is an outsider.

Mr. M. A. Chakko.—(6). May I know who that person is.

Mr. T. Narayana Menon.—The person referred to is Mr Chaterjee of Calcutta.

License fee for boats—extension of period for payment.

338. **Mr. K. M. Ibrahim.**—With reference to question No. 284 and the answer thereon during the last but one meeting of the council, will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether the Chief Engineer in his Memo P. 38/08, dated 14th December 1932 (30th Vrischigam 1108), extended the period of paying the license fee of motor boats till the 15th Dhanu 1108;

(b) why in spite of the above mentioned order the Canal authorities at Kottappuram, hauled up boats on the 1st of Dhanu though the Ernakulam authorities were charitable enough to permit the line boats to leave that jetty on the same date;

(c) how this directly opposed actions of the two Superintendents on the same order of the Chief Engineer can be accounted for;

(d) why on the 2nd of Dhanu line boats were permitted to leave the Kottappuram jetty as usual and on the same day they were hauled up at Ernakulam;

(e) whether this alteration of refusals and permissions causing great inconvenience to the travelling public was taken note of by the Government and what they intend to do in the matter?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—(a) The Chief Engineer while sanctioning the request of the Boat Owners' Association of 27th Vrischigam 1108, ordered on 14th December 1932 (29th Vrischigam 1108), that the 1st instalment should be paid at once and the 2nd, by the 1st week of Dhanu 1108.

(b) and (c) This order did not reach the Canal Superintendent, in time and, therefore, he had to take measures to collect the fees.

(d) The words 'at once' which appeared in the Chief Engineer's order was interpreted to mean 'forthwith' by the Canal Superintendent, Ernakulam, whereas it was meant only to convey 'without delay'.

(e) No inconvenience was caused to any body as the Chief Engineer was in Ernakulam camp then. Necessary instructions were given immediately and matters remedied.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly